DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 105 TM 022 005

AUTHOR Chauvin, Sheila; Ellett, Chad D.

TITLE "The Morning After": Year IV of a Study of Educators' Perceptions of an Evaluation Program Designed to Replace Lifetime Teacher Certification with a Renewable Credential.

PUB DATE Apr 94

NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994). For a related document, see ED 335 352.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Credentials; Educational Assessment; *Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Occupational Tests; Political Influences; *Professional Development; Program Development; Program Evaluation; School Districts; *Secondary School Teachers; *State Programs; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation; Testing Programs

IDENTIFIERS *Louisiana

ABSTRACT

This study continues prior efforts that were reported by the same authors to examine teacher perceptions of teacher assessment programs for a fourth year, one year after the initial statewide implementation and subsequent suspension by the state legislature, of the teacher assessment and evaluation program in Louisiana. The state initiated, statewide, on-the-job assessments in the Louisiana Teaching Internship Program (LTIP) for beginning teachers and the Louisiana Teacher Evaluation Program (LTEP) for teachers with three or more years of experience. In both programs, teachers were evaluated through the System for Teaching and Learning Assessment and Review (STAR). All teachers (n=3,082) and principals in 94 schools in 6 school districts were surveyed. Many of the 1,921 responses were not complete but could be used to some extent. Teachers did not seem aware of the extensive development and teacher input that had gone into these assessments. As they were implemented under high-stakes conditions, the assessments did not facilitate open, collegial, and collaborative professional development. Overall perceptions suggest that it will be difficult to interest Louisiana educators in similar assessment efforts. Four tables present study findings. (Contains 43 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 105

"THE MORNING AFTER":

Year IV of a Study of Educators' Perceptions of an Evaluation Program Designed to Replace Lifetime Teacher Certification with a Renewable Credential

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SHEILA W. CHAUVIN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sheila Chauvin
Southeastern Louisiana University

Chad D. Ellett
Louisiana State University

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

April, 1994

TM022005

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"THE MORNING AFTER":

Year IV of a Study of Educators' Perceptions of an Evaluation Program Designed to Replace Lifetime Certification with a Renewable Credential

Introduction

During the past decade, a number of states have moved rapidly toward the development of on-the-job assessment/evaluation procedures for classroom teachers targeting certification, career ladder, merit pay, professional development, and induction decisions. States such as North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, Virginia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Missouri, Connecticut, New Mexico, Texas, and others have followed Georgia's early lead to involve trained observers to complete relatively comprehensive evaluations of teachers. These large-scale efforts to assess teacher performance have been motivated by various accountability and educational reform policies established by state boards of education, state legislatures, and some school districts. Indeed, teacher assessment/evaluation programs appear to be a cornerstone of current efforts toward educational reform.

In 1988, Louisiana joined the teacher assessment/evaluation arena by adopting and funding legislation that called for the development and statewide implementation of comprehensive programs to assess on-the-job teaching performance for professional development and certification of all teachers (Louisiana Teaching Internship Law, 1986; The Children First Act, 1988). Extensive research and development efforts for Louisiana's teacher assessment/evaluation programs were implemented from 1988-1989 until 1990-1991 and initial statewide implementation of these programs occurred during the 1990-1991 school year. Prompted by pressure from teachers and teacher unions the Louisiana legislature suspended both programs at the end of the first year of statewide implementation.

Since the first year of program development (FY 1988-1989), a series of investigations have focused on teachers' and other educators' perceptions and beliefs regarding Louisiana's teacher assessment/evaluation programs. Earlier investigations sought to describe and understand perceptions and beliefs *in anticipation* of statewide implementation (Years I and II: Chauvin & Ellett, 1990, 1991) and during initial statewide implementation (Year III: Chauvin, Evans & Ellett, 1992). This study is a continuation of prior efforts (Chauvin & Ellett, 1990; 1991; Chauvin, Evans, & Ellett, 1992) for a fourth year--*one year after* initial statewide implementation and subsequent state-mandated suspension of these programs.

Responses obtained in the Year IV investigation represent perceptions and beliefs influenced by respondents' prior knowledge of these programs obtained through a variety of experiences: 1) participation in research and development (pilot) activities and/or participation as an assessor or assessee in the first year of statewide implementation; and/or 2) observations and experiences related to other teachers' and/or principals' participation in the teacher assessment/evaluation programs. Responses obtained in this study are compared and contrasted with the common perceptions and beliefs that were evidenced in the prior investigations.

Perspectives

It seems that the extent to which change efforts in an organization are successful and expeditious depends on a number of variables: 1) the nature and characteristics of the innovation; 2) the strategies employed in initiating and implementing change; 3) the nature and characteristics of organizational members involved in the change process; and 4) the nature and characteristics of the organization in which the planned change is targeted (Bennis, Benne, & Chin, 1969; Boyd, 1992; Corbett, Firestone, & Rossman, 1987; Firestone and Corbett, 1988;

Fullan, 1981, 1982, 1985; Giacquinta, 1973; Havelock, 1983; Hord, 1992; Wilson & Corbett, 1983). With these variables in mind, the continued investigation of educators' perceptions of the Louisiana programs provided an opportunity to examine the role of these variables in a specific context that represented large-scale planned change -- cultural/normative change that was externally imposed on every teacher and educator in every public school in the state. Questions about facilitating successful planned change were important to the overall approach used in this fourth phase of investigation educators' perceptions and beliefs about these teacher assessment/evaluation programs. For example, what have been consistent and/or changing theme evidenced in educators' responses to these programs since they were first introduced through the 1988 legislation? Are teachers the true gatekeepers of educational reform? If teacher assessment/evaluation serves as a cornerstone of educational reform, what can we learn from Louisiana's experiences to facilitate the development and maintenance of *positive and receptive* perceptions held by teachers and other education professionals for such change initiatives? What role did educators' perceptions and beliefs play in the development, implementation, and ultimate suspension of the Louisiana teaching internship and teacher evaluation programs?

Assessment/Evaluation and Planned Change

Indeed, a state-mandated teacher evaluation program designed to *replace lifetime certification with a renewable credential*, from which no practicing teacher is exempt, reflects significant change for teachers, principals, and schools as organizations. Such efforts represent cultural/normative change (Chauvin, 1992) -- change that may threaten teachers' and others' beliefs about "who we are" and "how we do things around here" (Corbett, Firestone, &

Rossman, 1987). Whether change is encouraged through school, district, or state level efforts (e.g., large-scale teacher assessment), it seems that educators' beliefs about individual and organizational roles and functions significantly contribute to the ultimate success or demise of planned change initiatives (Firestone & Corbett, 1988; Fullan, 1982, 1985, 1990; Giacquinta, 1973; Hall & Hord, 1987; Joyce, 1990; McLaughlin & Pfeiffer, 1988; Waugh & Punch, 1985).

The literature on organizational change of the past twenty years support the important roles of both innovators and stakeholders in facilitating successful change. Similarly, planned change is influenced by external and internal organizational features, individual personality and behavior factors, as well as unique contextual features of school/district organizations. While the literature seems to offer some attempts to describe implementation of various reform efforts, little seems to be available in terms of systematic studies of initial perceptions regarding large-scale reform or planned change efforts (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Giacquinta, 1973, 1975; Kaslow & Giacquinta, 1974; Parker, 1980). Assessment of teachers' and other professional educators' perceptions, beliefs, and receptivity to essential elements of large-scale educational reform initiatives (e.g., teacher assessment/evaluation) seem critical to the enhancement of successful adoption and implementation.

Darling-Hammond (1990) and others (e.g., Fullan, 1990; Waugh & Punch, 1987) suggest that teachers are the true gatekeepers of educational reform, not principals, school superintendents, or policy makers. How, then, do we encourage and support teachers' receptivity to new assessment/evaluation practices or licensure/certification programs when they suggest significant changes in "who we are" and "how we do things around here"? The literature

on change process in schools, as well as the experiences in states such as Louisiana, may enhance our understanding about facilitating positive and successful teacher assessment/evaluation programs that target professional development and licensure/certification purposes.

Historical Overview of the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR

In response to legislation provided in The Louisiana Teaching Internship Law (1984) and The Children First Act (1988), Louisiana initiated statewide efforts to develop a comprehensive, on-the-job assessment system to be used with all beginning teachers (1 to 2 years experience) in an internship program (The Louisiana Teaching Internship Program - LTIP) and in determining renewable certification of all 45,000 experienced teachers (3 or more years experience) (The Louisiana Teacher Evaluation Program - LTEP) in Louisiana. The LTIP and the LTEP were initiated to fulfill both formative and summative evaluation purposes. Placing primary emphasis on the formative, professional development purposes of the LTIP and LTEP, a major focus of these programs was the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms.

The system developed for and used in these programs was the System for Teaching and learning Assessment and Review (STAR) (Ellett, Loup & Chauvin, 1990). The STAR was designed to build on efforts of other states to identify and assess elements of teaching reflected in the extant process/product literature on effective teaching (Brophy, 1985; Porter & Brophy, 1986) and newer concerns about the assessment of knowledge of content, pedagogy, and curriculum (Shulman, 1987). In essence, the traditional focus on teacher behaviors in most first generation teacher evaluation programs was extended to include inferences made about student learning and the quality of teacher and student interactions. The version of the STAR used in these programs (Ellett, Loup & Chauvin, 1990) also included a variety of important assessment

indicators new to the field such as indicators of reflective and comprehensive planning, and the teaching of thinking skills. The STAR was also developed to focus on the total learning environment and to effectively accommodate the variety of unique teaching and learning contexts in which teachers and students interact (Ellett, Loup, & Chauvin, 1991).

The STAR was developed for use in these programs to support conceptions of teaching and learning as interactive and dynamic, and with a primary focus on students and their learning. Teachers and other educators were also viewed as learners in their professional reflections, and in interactions with one another as a result of these assessment/evaluation activities (e.g., conferences, feedback resources, and professional development activities). In essence, the STAR model developed for the LTIP and the LTEP was developed to move the teacher assessment field forward in terms of "what" is measured within the context of a state mandate targeting periodic, renewable certification for all teachers, as well as how teachers' and others' view teaching and learning processes and learn together to continually enhance professional knowledge and skills.

In keeping with the statewide impetus for educational reform, the STAR assessment process used in the LTIP and LTEP was developed based on a model that: (1) puts the "light on the learner", (2) incorporates multiple assessors with multiple observations and (3) emphasizes on-going professional improvement based on formative and summative results. Also, critical to the support and assessment components of these programs is the role of principals, master teachers and other educators who have been certified in the use of the assessment programs (i.e., LTIP and LTEP). These professional educators served as members of an assessment team and resource persons in assisting teachers in their continued professional development.

Overview of Past Investigations: Years I, II, and III

Development of the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR included input from and endorsement of classroom teachers and other key educators (e.g., principals, assistant principals, instructional supervisors, college faculty, and Department of Education personnel) in Louisiana (for example, see Chauvin & Ellett, 1990, 1991; Chauvin, Naik and Ellett, 1991; Chauvin, Loup, Claudet, Hill & Lofton, 1991; Chauvin, Lofton, Loup, Evans, Hill, Claudet & Ellett, 1991; Ellett, Chauvin, Loup & Naik, 1990; Ellett, Naik, Loup, Chauvin & Evans, 1990; Evans & Chauvin, 1992). Throughout the research and development activities (1988-1991) input about educators' perceptions of these programs was sought from practicing professionals in the field, as well as representatives of teacher preparation programs in colleges/universities. Input obtained from literally thousands of education professionals, statewide, was used to develop and refine research and development activities throughout the project period.

Prior efforts to examine educators' perceptions and beliefs about these programs included three phases: Year I - initial investigation of perceptions and beliefs *two years prior* to statewide implementation, reported in Chauvin and Ellett (1990); Year II -- follow-up investigation of perceptions and beliefs *one year prior* to implementation, reported in Chauvin and Ellett (1991); and Year III -- investigation of perceptions and beliefs of program participants (assessors and assessees) *during the initial implementation*, reported in Chauvin, Evans, and Ellett (1992).

Year I

During the 1988-89 pilot year, educators were surveyed regarding their level of acceptance and initial perceptions of a new and innovative program. Given that Louisiana was venturing into "new territory" by replacing lifetime teaching certificates with renewable

professional certificates resulting from evaluation through an on-the-job performance assessment process, an understanding of the initial perceptions and opinions of Louisiana educators seemed critical if these programs were to be well-received and successfully implemented. This preliminary investigation of educators who were informed about the program revealed substantial support for both the teaching internship and teacher evaluation programs (Chauvin & Ellett, 1990). Overall, few significant differences were noted in the responses of participating educators regarding the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR. A review of qualitative data substantiated response patterns evidenced in the quantitative analysis of this initial investigation that revealed educators' support and positive anticipation of these programs. Policy issues related to the selection of assessment team members, protection from social and political pressures, confidentiality, time and money issues were evident in respondents' written responses to open-ended items. At the time of this initial investigation, responses seem to indicate the need for individuals responsible for statewide implementation to address such concerns and consider various options related to issues such as local selection procedures, allocation of release time or additional compensation for activities beyond regular teacher responsibilities, quality control in assessor preparation and maintenance of standards, implementation procedures. Respondents' comments strongly supported the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR and seemed to indicate a general openness and willingness to effect changes associated with these programs; however, there was also an overriding concern related to the potential for shortened and rushed timelines and less-than-adequate allocation of resources (e.g., finances and personnel) to facilitate implementation consistent with the intended design and purpose of program models. Educators communicated in their comments a "mind-set" that good things have gone awry in the past

because of "too much, too fast" and the lack of strong commitment to high quality implementation by all levels -- state and local educators and policy-makers.

Year II

As implementation target dates of these programs approached and as policy and program implementation decisions were being drafted, an assessment of teachers' perceptions and changing perceptions was continued into the second pilot year (Chauvin & Ellett, 1991). Overall, respondents' written comments to open-ended items in this second-year study revealed general excitement about the programs and their potential effects on improving teaching and learning in Louisiana classrooms. Many individuals from all education positions stated that they had already experienced positive changes and improvement since completing pilot certification program activities. With regard to the STAR, respondents appeared most positive about the extensive and comprehensive nature of the instrument, the strong research base, and the specificity and objectivity of the indicators.

Despite the strong positive support and anticipation of implementation of these programs, comments reiterated concerns communicated in the initial investigation regarding time, funding and adequate resources, assessment team selection procedures, quality control of standards and procedures, orientation and staff development/inservice and protection of due process rights. There also seemed to be stronger concern in this Phase II investigation than in the first study regarding the potential for "watering down" and "rushing in" the programs before all critical implementation components were in place and decision/procedures finalized. Also, as the scheduled statewide implementation grew closer, there seemed to be a heightened concern regarding the potential for "losing the life certificate". In fact, there were more instances of

teachers expressing acceptance of the process and link to certification for *new* teachers, but dissatisfaction that experienced teachers would not be "grandfathered" into the program.

Year III

Year III represented a continuing effort to assess educators' perceptions of these programs while they were participating in the programs under real, high stakes conditions (internship or certification) associated with the first full year of statewide implementation in 1990-91. While no teacher faced an imminent loss of certification, the general feeling among educators during the initial year of statewide implementation was that teachers' lifetime certificates were "on the line".

The results from this study revealed a significant disparity between perceptions held prior to statewide implementation regarding what the programs "would be like" and how they "really are". Results revealed widespread frustration among teachers who were trying to "do what was expected" of them, without really understanding those expectations, as well as inconsistent implementation of many components (e.g., classroom observations, assessment decisions, feedback conferences) of these programs. To further complicate matters, educators perceived that program implementation rules and policies changed too frequently, clear communication was sorely lacking, and misinformation was rampant. Issues such as proper planning, scheduling, and the hiring of a sufficient number of assessors and a less-than-adequate level of school- and district-level support for teachers was also evident in educators' responses.

Some educators viewed policy and procedural changes during implementation as welcome refinements, while others expressed concern that such program revisions were moving toward a "watering down" of the program and evidenced a bowing to the demands of teachers' unions.

They were very concerned that the LTIP and the LTEP were immediately becoming nothing more than exercises in bureaucracy and paperwork. Respondents expressed frustration that the program was being "rushed in" without adequate resources (time, money, people, etc.) and that, in the confusion, the opportunity to implement high quality programs and truly improve Louisiana classrooms was being lost. A large number of respondents generally expressed support for the STAR as a comprehensive guide to effective teaching which is well-grounded in the research literature; however, they were concerned that the less-than-satisfactory implementation of the LTIP and the LTEP was contributing to heightened negativism and perhaps the ultimate demise of these statewide programs.

Teachers were divided in assessing the outcomes of their experiences during the assessment year. Some said the process did little to improve their teaching and took time away from their students as they prepared for the evaluation, others said they had already experienced positive changes, become better teachers, and hoped the program could be saved. Many teachers commented that the assessment process was too stressful and a "show" rather than daily practice. Comments received from elementary and secondary teachers were very consistent. Overall, comments provided by other educators (e.g., principals, outside assessors, supervisors and college faculty) were consistent with those summarized for teachers. Administrators and others functioning as assessors evidenced a strong call for more time and thought in developing sound program implementation policies and preparation. Of particular concern, was the need to continue preparation and certification/re-certification of assessors. An often cited concern was in regard to the selection and preparation of assessors and the need to provide ongoing, training

for assessors and increased practice in actual classroom settings prior to participation in "real" situations involving a teacher's certification.

Year IV

Year IV focused on educators' perceptions of the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR *one year after* initial, statewide implementation and the legislature's decision to immediately suspend these programs. Since the programs were no longer being implemented, a high-inference, semantic differential scale was used as an alternative response mode to obtain information from educators' relative to their lasting perceptions of these programs.

Drawing on the work of Licata and Willower (1975; 1978) and Ellett and Licata (1982), a measure of *environmental robustness* was used for data collection. According to Ellett and Licata (1982) environmental robustness is conceptualized as the "perceived dramatic content of school structure" (p. 33) and is operationally defined in terms of respondents' perceptions that a particular school structure is relative *challenging, important, interesting, meaningful, fresh, unusual, thrilling, active, powerful,* and *action-packed*. For this study, the concept of robustness (i.e., "dramatic content") was used to investigate educators' lingering perceptions of the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR and their respective local district teacher evaluation programs. According to Ellett and Licata (1982), the relative dramatic content (robustness) reflects a focus on empathetic involvement that may be helpful in explaining the collective experience relevant to specific organizational roles or subgroups within an organization. For example, educators not personally undergoing the LTIP or LTEP during the initial implementation of these programs likely experienced a "ripple effect" and found it easy to empathize with their colleagues who participated in the LTIP or LTEP as either assessors or assessees. Attitudes towards these

programs (LTIP, LTEP, and local evaluation) and the STAR reflected, in part, educators' beliefs about their personal roles in these programs and the influences of their experiences or observations of others during the period when the LTIP and LTEP were being developed and implemented.

Methodology

All teachers (n=3082) and principals (n=94) in 94 schools in six school districts in Louisiana were surveyed in the fourth year phase of this study. The school sample closely reflected the statewide distribution of all schools by level and by socioeconomic status. Instrument packets were received from 1921 teachers and 87 principals. The response rate for the total sample of teachers was 62.33%; for the total sample of principals, it was 92.55%. At least 40% of the teachers in 81 schools (86.17%) and the school principal in each of these 81 schools returned the completed questionnaire packet.

Data were collected through an evaluative semantic differential instrument that reflected the robustness construct for each of the four target concepts: LTIP, LTEP, STAR, and local teacher evaluation (LOCAL). Ten bipolar descriptors were used for each of the four subscales/concepts and included the following descriptive pairs: *challenging-dull, unimportant-important, interesting-boring, meaningless-meaningful, fresh-stale, unusual-usual, thrilling-quieting, passive-active, powerful-weak*, and *uneventful-action packed*. Respondents used a seven-point rating scale of the following format:

Dull 1=Very 2=Quite 3=Slightly 4=Undecided 5=Slightly 6=Quite 7=Very *Challenging*

Prompts for the four subscales/concepts were as follows:

1) "The Louisiana Teaching Internship Program (LTIP) is ...";

2) "The Louisiana Teacher Evaluation Program (LTEP) is ....";

3) "The System for Teaching and learning Assessment and Review (STAR) is ...."; and

4) "Personnel evaluation in my school district is ....".

A demographic questionnaire was also included in the complete instrument packet.

Descriptive statistical summaries and Pearson product-moment correlations were computed using teachers as the units of analysis. Similar analyses were also completed using principals as the units of analysis. Analyses were completed for the total sample of schools, as well as by school level (elementary, middle, and secondary).

Results

Participant Sample

A comparison between the characteristics of teachers and principals in the sample and the statewide profile suggests that the sample is representative of the teachers and principals across Louisiana (Louisiana Department of Education, 1991). A summary of the characteristics of responding teachers and principals is included in the following sections.

Teachers

Characteristics of teacher respondents for Year IV closely parallel the demographic characteristics of teachers respondents in Years I, II, and II of the study. Results of the demographic questionnaire items revealed that the typical teacher respondent was a white, tenured, female elementary teacher with a bachelor degree. Male teachers comprised 18.1% of the total sample. Minorities comprised 21.5% of the sample, with blacks representing the largest

minority group (20.4%. Almost half of the teachers (49%) reported that they were currently teaching in an elementary school, while 22.7% were teaching in middle schools and 28.3% were teaching in secondary schools.

A majority of teachers (75.0%) were teaching in regular education situations. Every content area was represented in the sample of returned questionnaires. The largest percentage of teachers in the sample (38.7%) reported that they were teaching basic skills/elementary content. Special education teachers comprised 10.2% of the sample. Teachers in other content areas represented similar percentages, and Art/Misc reflected the smallest content area representation (2.0%).

A majority of teachers (53%) reported teaching in their present school five or more years, and 67.3% of the sample reported having attained tenure in their employing school district. Teachers with six or more years of professional experience comprised 72.9% of the total sample. Most teachers (n=1511, 79.1% reported that they were teaching in a school district where management/labor relations were unionized, and a majority of teachers (57.2%) reported being dues-paying members of a teacher union/organization. Only 35.0% of the teachers reported being members in one or more other professional organizations.

Principals

Characteristics of the principals responding to this investigation (Year IV) were also similar to the demographic features of principals responding in Years I, II, and III. The typical principal in the sample for Year IV was a white, male, elementary school principal with a specialist degree or at least 30 graduate hours beyond the master degree. Ethnic background of

principals was similar to that of teachers. Minority groups represented in the sample included Africa-Americans (23.3%) and Hispanics (1.2%).

Ninety-four percent (94%) of the principals reported having 15 or more years combined teaching and administrative experience. Of the principals surveyed, 53.5% reported their current assignment as their first principalship, with 43.1% having been principal in their schools for the past five or more years. Over half of the principals (56.4%) reported that they were working in an elementary school, while 20.5% were in middle schools and 23.1% were in secondary schools. A majority (82.6%) of the principals reported having attained tenure with their employing school district. In regards to professional memberships, 78.7% reported being members in one or more professional organizations.

Data Analyses

For the teacher group, approximately 400 of the 1921 completed instrument packets were returned with only the demographic questionnaire completed; the items pertaining to the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR, and/or the local district evaluation program were left completely blank. A review of the response forms revealed that approximately 20% of the remaining 1500 respondents selected "undecided" for all or most of the items pertaining to the four subscales/concepts (LTIP, LTEP, STAR, Local).

In a very small number of cases, handwritten notes were included with the returned instrument packet that conveyed strong emotional overtones, and open hostility toward the programs and/or the developers. Notes included on these questionnaires reflected personal criticisms of the programs, the investigators, the design of the study, the format of the survey form, or simply comments indicating their refusal to participate in any type of survey pertaining

to these programs. For example, one questionnaire included a rather long, handwritten note that expressed a teachers' concern with low salaries, social problems experienced by students in her school, and her personal discontent with being sent the questionnaire to provide input about a program she perceived was developed to take away teachers' *lifetime* certificates. An extreme example that reflected the strength of educators' emotions was a questionnaire returned with the following comment: "*@!? (a member of the research and development staff) -- Long live (an individual who openly opposed these programs)". Characteristic of these notes was the strong, negative, emotional, and sometimes irrational, overtones. In the majority of instances, handwritten comments revealed that the individuals were reacting to inaccurate information regarding specific aspects of the programs or the STAR. Notes and comments of this nature were received from only a few principals. Analyses of the data and conclusions drawn from the results take into account these observations.

Descriptive statistical summaries were completed for all subscales/concepts for teachers in all schools and by school level. As shown in Table 1, teachers' perceptions of the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR, and local personnel evaluation programs (LOCAL) were generally similar. No significant differences were noted between the total sample and analyses completed by school level. However, teachers tended to perceive the LTIP slightly less favorably than the LTEP. Teachers' perceptions of the STAR were only slightly more positive than their perceptions of the LTIP or LTEP, but their perceptions of the LOCAL were most favorable of all. Mean subscale scores for teachers for the total sample and by school level were similar (31.27 - 39.08) and the standard deviation scores were rather large (15.18 - 17.36).

Responses were also examined by computing a mean percentage of the maximum possible score (x%maximum) for each of the subscales. Since the subsamples differed in size, this calculation facilitated comparisons among the various groups of teachers and principals(total sample, school level subsamples: elementary, middle, and secondary). As shown in Table 1, teachers perceived the local evaluation program as being more robust (i.e., positive perceptions) than the LTIP, the LTEP, or the STAR. Teachers (total sample and by school level) also tended to perceive the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR is very similar ways.

Table 2 shows the results of Pearson product-moment correlations between the STAR, the LTIP, and the LTEP subscales for teachers and for principals for the total sample and by school level. Using teachers as the units of analysis, correlations between teachers' perceptions of the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR and their local evaluation programs (LOCAL) were strongly and positively correlated in every instance (total sample and by school level). Similarly, the relative strength of these correlations was consistent for the total sample and for analyses completed by school level. It is important to note, however, the rather substantial number of teachers who responded "undecided" to most or all of the items on the robustness scale.

As shown in Table 3, principals' perceptions of these programs were similar, but mean subscale scores were generally higher for principals than for teachers in analyses for the total sample and by school level. Table 3 also shows that principals perceived the LTIP, LTEP and the STAR as more robust (a positive perception) than their respective local evaluation programs (LOCAL). The range of x% maximum possible scores for elementary school principal responses was somewhat smaller than the ranges for middle or secondary school principals. Middle school principals' perceptions were similar in pattern to the responses for the total sample, but the

Table 1

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Subscales/Concepts of the Robustness Semantic Differential Scale for the Total Sample of Teachers and by School Level

Subscale/Concept		M	SD	%Max[a]
LTIP[b]				
	All	33.87	15.52	48.39
	Elementary	34.90	14.92	49.86
	Middle	32.71	16.81	46.73
	Secondary	32.93	15.49	47.04
LTEP				
	All	32.30	15.69	46.14
	Elementary	33.46	15.18	47.80
	Middle	31.27	16.74	44.67
	Secondary	31.03	15.67	44.33
STAR				
	All	33.44	15.81	47.78
	Elementary	34.38	15.29	49.11
	Middle	31.92	16.95	45.60
	Secondary	32.86	15.81	46.94
LOCAL				
	All	37.67	15.92	53.82
	Elementary	39.08	15.34	55.83
	Middle	36.92	17.36	52.74
	Secondary	35.82	15.63	51.17

[a]Percentage of maximum (% Max) is calculated by dividing the subscale mean score by the maximum possible score for the subscale (e.g. 33.87/70 = 48.39%).
[b]Each subscale has ten (10) items; the maximum possible score is 70.

Table 2

Summary of Intercorrelations Among the Robustness Semantic Differential Subscales for the Total Sample of Teachers and by School Level

Subscale/Concept		LTEP	STAR	LOCAL
LTIP				
	All	.85**	.80**	.53**
	Elementary	.84**	.79**	.49**
	Middle	.88*	.83**	.56**
	Secondary	.86**	.77**	.58**
LTEP				
	All		.84**	.51**
	Elementary		.84**	.49**
	Middle		.86**	.53**
	Secondary		.83**	.52**
STAR				
	All			.52**
	Elementary			.49**
	Middle			.51**
	Secondary			.56**

*$p < .001$
**$p < .0001$

Table 3

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Subscales/Concepts of the Robustness Semantic Differential Scale for the Total Sample of Principals and by School Level

Subscale/Concept		M	SD	%Max[a]
LTIP[b]				
	All	45.25	15.80	64.64
	Elementary	45.72	14.28	65.31
	Middle	47.94	11.56	68.49
	Secondary	41.84	21.66	59.78
LTEP				
	All	45.81	16.59	65.44
	Elementary	45.78	15.68	65.40
	Middle	49.63	11.83	70.90
	Secondary	42.29	22.14	60.42
STAR				
	All	47.22	16.14	67.46
	Elementary	48.24	14.49	68.91
	Middle	50.06	12.07	71.52
	Secondary	42.00	22.20	60.00
LOCAL				
	All	39.82	14.77	56.89
	Elementary	42.73	12.56	61.04
	Middle	39.00	14.86	55.71
	Secondary	32.89	18.26	46.99

[a]Percentage of maximum (% Max) is calculated by dividing the subscale mean score by the maximum possible score for the subscale (e.g. 33.87/70 = 48.39%).
[b]Each subscale has ten (10) items; the maximum possible score is 70.

differences were slightly larger among the four concepts. The greatest differences were noted in the x% maximum possible scores for secondary school principals.

As shown in Table 4, there were strong, positive correlations between principals' perceptions of the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR for the total sample and by school level analyses. Results shown in Table 4 also reveal mild to moderate relationships between each of these concepts and the principals' respective local evaluation programs in analyses completed for the total sample and for elementary school principals. However, perceptions of the robustness of the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR and their local evaluation programs (LOCAL) were strong, positive, and statistically significant for secondary school principals; but they were weak and nonsignificant for middle school principals.

Upon close examination, an analysis of the descriptive statistical summaries for each of the subscales for teachers and for principals, as well as comparisons between teachers' responses and principals responses for the total sample revealed several interesting patterns. For each of the subcales/concepts, an examination of teachers' and principals' responses to each of the ten bipolar descriptors for the total sample revealed a number of interesting patterns. The results of these analyses are described for each subscales/concept in the following sections.

LTIP: Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions

Teachers' responses to the various adjective pairs on the robustness scale revealed that they are generally "undecided" in terms of their perceptions of the LTIP (range: 32.3% to 57.5%). While some teachers perceived the LTIP to be "dull" (21.0%), others viewed it as "challenging" (38.2%). Similarly, 32.9% of the teachers viewed the LTIP as "unimportant", and 34.4% reported that it was "important". Teachers responded in similar ways for a number

Table 4

Summary of Intercorrelations Among the Robustness Semantic Differential Subscales for the Total Sample of Principals and by School Level

Subscale/Concept		LTEP	STAR	LOCAL
LTIP				
	All	.90****	.86****	.45****
	Elementary	.87****	.79****	.36**
	Middle	.77****	.86****	.39
	Secondary	.99****	.98****	.63**
LTEP				
	All		.92****	.44***
	Elementary		.85****	.29*
	Middle		.97****	.18
	Secondary		.99****	.72***
STAR				
	All			.47****
	Elementary			.35*
	Middle			.12
	Secondary			.70***

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
****p < .0001

of contrasting descriptors. For example, teachers responses on the robustness subscale for the LTIP revealed the following perceptions: *The LTIP is....* "boring/interesting" (29.3%/27.9%), "uneventful/action-packed" (26.8%/25.0%). More teachers perceived the LTIP to be "weak" (35.7%) than did teachers who viewed it as "powerful" (24.1%), but 40.2% of the teachers were undecided in their perceptions on this dimension. Similarly, more teachers viewed the LTIP as "unusual" (36.0%) than did teachers who viewed it as "usual" (15.0%), and 48,8% were undecided. Interestingly, teachers were undecided (57.5%) whether the LTIP was "quieting" (27.8%) or "thrilling" (14.8%).

In contrast, principals' responses revealed that they perceive the LTIP as rather robust. much smaller percentage of principals reported that they were "undecided" on the various adjective pairs for this subscale/concept (range: 8.2%-21.1%). A large percentage of the principals perceived the LTIP as "challenging" (84.3%); only 3.9% of the principals viewed it to be "dull". Similarly, principals perceived the LTIP to be "important" (75.0%), "interesting" (77.1%), "meaningful" (61.7%), "active" (76.7%), and "action-packed" (64.8%). Principals also reported that they perceived the LTIP to be "unusual" (59.2%) and "fresh" (63.4%). Interestingly, principals were generally split in their perceptions of whether the LTIP was "weak" (54.6%) or "powerful" (58.3%).

LTEP: Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions

A similar pattern of perceptions for teachers and for principals was noted in comparisons of their responses for the LTEP. Teachers were generally undecided in their perception of the LTEP in terms of robustness (range: 26.8% - 54.2%). Several dimensions were interesting to note. Teachers appear to perceive the LTIP as "challenging" (41.4%), but "unimportant"

(43.4%. Similarly , they perceive the LTEP to be "unusual" (42.1)%, "weak" (43.2%), and "meaningless" (51.9%), but approximately 30% of the teachers are undecided about the LTEP for these dimensions of robustness.

Principals appear to perceive the LTIP in much the same way as the LTEP, only more strongly positive/robust. Percentages of responses for "undecided" were rather small (range: 7.1% - 26.1%), in comparison to those obtained for teachers. Nearly, nearly two-thirds to three-fourths of the principals responded in ways that indicated positive, robust perceptions of the LTEP. For example, principals reported that the LTEP is "challenging" (82.7%), "important" (72.2%), "interesting" (61.6%), "meaningful" (70.0%), "fresh" (61.8%), and "unusual" (60.4%). Principals also reported that the LTEP is " active" (72.2%), powerful" (61.8%) and "action-packed" (66.6%). Principals indicated that the LTEP is generally perceived by this group of educators as somewhat quieting (24.6%), yet "thrilling" (49.2%); however, 26.1% are "undecided".

STAR: Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions

Teachers' perceptions of the STAR parallel their perceptions of the LTIP and LTEP. At least one-third of the teachers are "undecided" on the various adjective pairs of the robustness scale (range: 34.6% - 56.8%). The results of teachers responses to "dull-challenging" are rather mixed: dull (26.2%), undecided (34.6%), and challenging (39,1%). Similar patterns of responses were noted for the adjective pair, "unimportant-important", "boring-interesting", "meaningless-meaningful", "stale-fresh", "passive-active" and "uneventful--action-packed".

Principals' responses revealed a very different pattern than teachers. More than 70% of the principals indicated that the STAR was "challenging", "important", "interesting",

"meaningful", "fresh", "active", "powerful", and "action-packed. Principals also indicated that the STAR is "unusual" (49.9%) and "thrilling" (47.1%). In every instance, a larger percentage of principals indicated these descriptors in the "quite" and/or "very" rating than the "slightly" rating available on the robustness subscale for this concept.

LOCAL: Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions

Teachers and principals responded in very similar ways to the adjective pairs for the LOCAL subscale/concept. Teachers (T) and principals (P) indicated that their respective LOCAL programs were "challenging" (T=59.7%%; P=73.6%), "important" (T=69.7%; P=86.1%), and "usual" (T=58.2%; P=78.9%). Interestingly, teachers and principals' responses were rather mixed on several dimensions of the robustness scale (stale-fresh, quieting/thrilling, uneventful--action-packed).

Discussion

Statewide teacher assessment/evaluation was initiated in Louisiana with two important pieces of legislation: *The Louisiana Teaching Internship Law* (1984) and *The Children First Act* (1988). Funding to support the development and subsequent implementation of these programs was also provided beginning in 1988. A major focus of these programs was to provide on-the-job teaching performance assessment programs for *all* beginning and experienced teachers for both initial and renewable certification. Thus Louisiana's efforts provide another example of large-scale teacher assessment. A unique aspect of the Louisiana programs, however, was the direct and legislated link to improve teaching and learning in classrooms. As a result, these programs were also developed to support and facilitate *reflective and collaborative professional development.*

Through the research and development process, educator input has been a key concern. The researchers/developers provided numerous opportunities for educators to provide input at each stage of the development process. For example: comments, concerns, and suggestions were solicited through assessor training program questionnaires/evaluation, teacher participated in statewide standards-setting committees, teacher committees were established to review the STAR document and related assessment issues, and educators' participated in school-based studies and a wide variety of survey research, and the principal and one master teacher for each school in the state was asked to return to their respective schools and inservice teachers once they completed the assessor training program. Despite these efforts, there is evidence that generally teachers were not aware of the extensive developmental work and participation of practicing teachers and administrators in these programs, as they have progressed from conceptualization to statewide implementation. Similarly, it appears that teachers may not have perceived these activities as involvement, or at the very least, the type or level of involvement that they desired.

The results reported here for Year IV seem to sharply contrast perceptions held by teachers and other education professionals in anticipation of program implementation (Chauvin & Ellett, 1990; 1991; 1992). However, they appear to support the realization of concerns and fears expressed in earlier studies regarding actual implementation activities. Perceptions held in Year III of this study seemed to confirm the reality of fears and concerns expressed in earlier studies. Results of this study reflect a continuing pattern of declining positive receptivity toward these programs that had been evidenced in prior studies. The results also suggest that the neutral to negative perceptions of these programs are, to some degree, a general reflection of teachers' resistance to assessment/evaluation and accountability processes in general. Teachers in this

study appeared to view the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR, and their LOCAL programs in very similar ways. Teachers did not seem to differentiate the assessment system (STAR) from the implementation of program procedures (the LTIP and the LTEP). That is, beliefs and perceptions of personnel evaluation (LOCAL) -- as it has been traditionally conducted in past years -- has some influence on the initial perceptions that teachers' have for other types of assessment/evaluation process (e.g., the LTIP and the LTEP. Also, unlike principals and master teachers who were directly involved in two years of research and development activities, teachers may not have had adequate time and/or direct involvement with the assessment expectations (STAR) and program procedures to be adequately informed and prepared for statewide implementation under *high-stakes, real conditions*.

As Darling-Hammond (1990) and others in the change literature suggest, teachers filter new programs through their past experiences and sets of beliefs and values. For some teachers, their frames of reference may have been limited to experiences and beliefs related to local evaluation programs, information provided by people who were openly opposed to these reform initiatives, and/or their long-held beliefs about lifetime certification. Although every teacher had the opportunity to participate in an orientation session about the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR, it did not provide extensive hands-on practice with the content and use of these programs and the assessment system. Only one experienced teacher from each school was involved in an intense, seven-day, assessor certification program that provided targeted professional development and practice with the system prior to statewide implementation. No specific, statewide provisions were made to facilitate master teachers sharing detailed information with fellow teachers at the school building level. If new information and "ways of doing things" are not provided up front,

then teachers are left with little other resources than to draw on past experiences and beliefs. This seems to have been the case for a number of teachers in Louisiana.

Results of this study suggest that principals have somewhat different views of the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR, and their respective LOCAL programs. Principals tended to view the statewide programs (LTIP/LTEP) and the statewide assessment system (STAR) as more robust than their respective LOCAL programs. Results of correlation studies suggest that perceptions of these new programs (LTIP, LTEP and STAR) appear to be only moderately related to their perceptions of their respective local personnel evaluation programs (LOCAL). An explanation for these findings seems to be that principals were able to develop a greater understanding of the LTIP, the LTEP and the STAR, and of the unique certification purposes and uses that these programs were designed to meet. These results also seem to support that principals' positive perceptions may be a result of their opportunities to: 1) be directly and intensely involved in pilot activities for these programs, 2) practice using the STAR in their own schools/districts, 3) interact with the program development staff and other educators while learning about these programs and the STAR, and 4) gradually "make sense" of these innovations before they were asked to participate in the programs "under real, high-stakes conditions."

Findings of this study, when interpreted within the broader set of findings obtained in Years I, II, and III, suggest that informed educators in Louisiana are still open and ready for opportunities to enhance their professional development. However, results also suggest that the LTIP and the LTEP, *as they were implemented under high-stakes conditions*, did not facilitate open, collegial, and collaborative professional development. The results of content analyses of educators' comments about their experiences during the first year of implementation (Year II of

this study) clearly documented the disparity between what was intended by the program developers and actual first-year implementation experiences. For example, research and development personnel who were involved in two years of development and pilot activities were not included in the initial statewide implementation of these programs; thus, there was no transition/bridge structure between pilot conditions and real, high-stakes conditions. Year IV results reported here suggest that these experiences have left lingering perceptions that indicate significant disparity between perceptions held prior to statewide implementation regarding what the programs "would be like" and "how they really were." The results also emphasize the importance of adequate orientation, staff development, and information-sharing -- prior to implementation. The findings also vividly support the recognized importance of providing individuals with appropriate and complementary levels of pressure and support throughout all phases of implementation. Clearly, a review of the findings from Years I-IV of this study suggest, appropriate levels of pressure and support were not well-matched to educators' needs throughout the progression of these programs from introduction to adoption to implementation. The result also point to the critical need to ensure that adequate and reasonable transition (time and activities) are included to facilitate movement from research and development (pilot conditions) to actual implementation (high-stakes conditions). That is, careful transition programs are needed to avoid gaps in teachers' and principals' understandings and *misperceptions* are minimized.

Analyses of data reported here were limited to the total sample of teachers and of principals, as well as analyses for these respondent groups by school level. Although the sample characteristics were very similar to those of samples in Years I, II, III for which no significant

differences in perceptions were found based on selected demographic variables, additional analyses to further example possible differences and relationships are being pursued using the data from the Year IV study. Also, investigations based on the Year IV data are continuing to gain greater understandings of educators' perceptions *within school districts* and *within individual schools*. As has been suggested in a related study that used the same sample of respondents as was used for this study (Chauvin, 1992), unique and very different results were found using teachers within schools as the units of analysis. Also found in Chauvin (1992) were relationships between teachers' perceptions and perceived principal behavior. For example, although teachers' receptivity to change did not appear to be related to their participation in the LTIP or the LTEP, their receptivity to cultural/normative change was negatively related to their perceptions of the principals' proactive/strategic leadership style. What are the relationships between teachers' perceptions of the LTIP, the LTEP, the STAR, and their respective LOCAL programs and their perceptions of principals' leadership style?

In this same study (Chauvin, 1992), teachers' self-perceptions of role orientation (bureaucratic and professional) and principal's self-perceptions of these role orientation variables were significantly related. Thus, questions linger about the relationships that may exist between teachers' perceptions of the study variables (LTIP, LTEP, STAR, and LOCAL) and perceptions of principal leadership style or the principals' perceptions of these programs. What are the relationships between teachers' and principals' perceptions of these programs: statewide? within schools? within individual schools? Analyses of the data continue to investigate these and other questions regarding educators' perceptions of teacher assessment/evaluation programs.

Efforts in Louisiana currently target the 1994-1995 school year for statewide implementation of the new *Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching* (LCET) program for the internship program (beginning teachers). In an initial series of interviews with informed educators (not reported as part of this study), it appears that limited pilot programs have been recently completed. During the 1993-1994 school year, school districts were mandated by the Department of Education to revise their local personnel evaluation programs to include the LCET. Professional development plans were revised accordingly, as well. At this point, it is not clear as to how the LCET will be used for complete statewide assessment/evaluation for certification purposes. Teachers do not seem to be concerned about the impending implementation of any new certification assessment programs. For example, one teacher representative was observed to say to fellow teachers in a faculty presentation, "(holding up a copy of the LCET)...."This is the new teacher evaluation--not much to it, not much to worry about. Everybody will do fine. Put in your folder and keep it. If you have any questions, we are here to answer them." Teachers attending the meeting asked no questions, folded their copy of the LCET and put it with their materials.

Currently, a review of LCET program reports, orientation, training, and assessment materials is underway. Interviews are being conducted and another questionnaire is being planned to obtain input from teachers, principals, and other educators (e.g., university faculty, curriculum/instructional supervisors, etc.). What has remained from the LTIP and the LTEP? How have the experiences and/or educational/inservice activities from the LTIP and the LTEP influenced educators' perceptions and understandings about their respective local evaluation programs and the LCET? What roles have educators' played in teacher assessment/evaluation

organizations. Based upon the results of this exploratory study, it seems difficult to come to any general set of conclusions regarding relationships between variables without first considering context variables (e.g., demographics characteristics: school size, school level, socioeconomic status of students). Similar difficulties are faced when one attempts to cultivate school cultures conducive to change. Although it seems clear that principals' and teachers' perceptions of their roles, their beliefs, attitudes and values, and their perceptions of one another are key considerations in cultivating a school culture, a critical attribute is the "fit" among these cultural variables and the ecological features of the school that support and nurture successful planned change initiatives (Boyd, 1992; Hall & Hord, 1987; Hord, 1992; Wood & Thompson, 1993).

The largest organizational unit that one can change in education is the school (Boyd, 1992; Goodlad, 1984; Hall & Hord, 1987; Joyce, 1990; Wood & Thompson, 1993). School districts are changed school-by-school. For change agents, unique differences among various school contexts becomes paradoxical: working within a single school to facilitate change can be accomplished, but applying the findings across school contexts cannot be as easily achieved. Yet, as is suggested by the school profile results for schools with very low perceived principal change facilitator style, district level factors may also play an influential role. Once again, the characteristic fit among these variables is a crucial factor. Thus, the findings reported here point to the need to use multiple methodologies and the greater complementary use of quantitative and qualitative approaches to research on schools as complex organizations. In essence, there is a critical need to develop and expand comprehensive, theoretical frameworks to explain both relationships among variables across

long-lasting success of change initiatives rests on the congruence of change characteristics with teachers' beliefs and values and the degree to which teachers have been oriented, have knowledge about such changes and have been directly involved in the development and/or implementation of suggested or mandated changes. In retrospect, it seems clear that teacher preparation (e.g., orientation, inservice, awareness/informational activities or publications) for this *major individual and organizational change* in "how we do things around here" (Corbett, et al., 1987) was not sufficient.

Results of the studies completed in Years I through IV demonstrate the phenomena often characterized as "burning the territory" for future attempts to address similar areas for improvement. Although some of the lingering perceptions evidenced in Year IV results suggest that some educators (e.g., principals) continue to hold positive views of the LTIP, the LTEP, and the STAR, the overall perceptions suggest that it will be quite difficult to get educators excited once again about venturing into such "new" territory. Future efforts will likely be met with heightened skepticism and fear, rather than enthusiasm and hope.

For educators in Louisiana, what may be lingering or "morning after" perceptions, may also influence future perceptions a "new dawn". The charge now seems to require responsible parties to listen carefully to what has been said by educators and to respond in appropriate ways so that teaching and learning may be enhanced. Educational reforms, such as teacher assessment/evaluation programs can enhance learning for students and educators, alike, as active, reflective, and collaborative partners in schools as learning communities.

References

Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D., & Chin, R. (1969). The planning of change. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston.

Boyd, V. (1992). School context: Bridge or barrier for change? Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Brophy, J. (1986). Teacher influences on student achievement. American Psychologist, October, 1069-1077.

Chauvin, S. W. (1992). An exploration of principal change facilitator style, bureaucratic and professional orientations, and teacher receptivity to change. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, Dissertation Abstracts International.

Chauvin, S.W. & Ellett, C.D. (1990). Initial perceptions of educators in Louisiana regarding the teaching internship and statewide teacher evaluation programs. Research Report, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Chauvin, S. W. & Ellett, C. D. (1991). Reflecting on teaching and learning: A study of school-level implementation of the STAR in nine schools. Technical Report Number 18, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Chauvin, S. W., Ellett, C. D., Claudet, J.G., Loup, K.S., Lofton, G. G. & Hill, F.H. (1990). Reflecting on teaching and learning: A study of school-level implementation of the STAR in nine schools. Technical Report Number 18, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Chauvin, S. W., Evans, R. L. & Ellett, C. D. (1992) Replacing lifetime certification with a renewable credential: Phase III of a study of Louisiana educators' perceptions about the Louisiana Teaching Internship and Statewide Teacher Evaluation Programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Chauvin, S. W., Lofton, G. G., Loup, K.S., Evans, R. L., Hill, F.H., Claudet, J. G. & Ellett, C. D. (1991). Concepts and issues in effecting school-wide staff development: Results of a year-long study of school-level implementation of a classroom-based, professional development model in three schools. Technical Report Number 24, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Chauvin, S. W., Loup, K. S., Claudet, J. G., Hill, F. H., & Lofton, G. G. (1991). Observations, perceptions, and beliefs of student, beginning, and experienced teachers about a statewide on-the-job performance assessment system: Results of a qualitative study involving nine schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Chauvin, S. W., Naik, N. S., & Ellett, C. D. (1991). A survey of teacher education courses in higher education institutions in Louisiana and a cross-listing with components of the System for Teaching and learning, Assessment and Review (STAR). Technical Report Number 31, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Corbett, H. D., Dawson, J. A. & Firestone, W. A. (1984). School context and school change: Implications for effective planning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Corbett, H. D., Firestone, W. A. & Rossman, G. B. (1987). Resistance to planned change and the sacred in school cultures. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 23, 4, 36-59.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Instructional policy into practice: The power of the bottom over the top. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12(3), 233-241.

Ellett, C.D. (1990). A new generation of classroom based assessments of teaching and learning: Concepts, issues and controversies from pilots of the Louisiana STAR. Concept Paper, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Ellett, C. D., & Licata, J. W. (1982). Teacher perceptions of organizational roles, robustness, and work environment. Journal of Educational Administration, 20(1), 33-44.

Ellett, C.D., Hill, F., Claudet, J. G. & Naik, N. (1990). A statewide content verification study of teaching and learning components of the System for Teaching and learning Assessment and Review (STAR). Research Report, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Ellett, C.D., Lofton, G.G., Chauvin, S.W., Loup, K.S. & Evans, R.L. (1990). Results of an initial iterative standards-setting task for certification of teachers using the System for Teaching and learning Assessment and Review (STAR) in Louisiana. Technical Report Number 15, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Ellett, C. D., Loup, K. S., & Chauvin, S. W. (1990). System for Teaching and learning, Assessment and Review (STAR): Annotated Guide to Teaching and Learning (Teaching Internship and Statewide Teacher Evaluation Program Form. College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Ellett, C. D., Loup, K. S., & Chauvin, S. W. (1991). Development, validity, and reliability of a new generation of assessments of effective teaching and learning: Future directions for the study of learning environments, Journal of Classroom Interaction, 26(2), 25-39.

Ellett, C.D., Loup, K.S., Chauvin, S.W. & Evans, R. L. (1991). Issues, pilot procedures and results of developing a semi-structured interview procedure to make knowledge inferences using the complete STAR assessment process. Technical Report Number 34, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Evans, R. L., Ellett, C. D., Hill, F.H., Claudet, J.G. & Naik, N.S. (1991). A statewide verification study of teaching and learning components of the System for Teaching and learning Assessment and Review (STAR). Technical Report Number 22, Louisiana Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Projects, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Firestone, W., & Corbett, H. D. (1988). Planned organizational change. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration, (pp. 321-340). New York: Longman.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 391-421.

Fullan, M. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In Joyce, B. (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fullan, M., Bennett, B. & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1990). Linking classroom and school improvement. Educational Leadership, 47, (8), 13-19.

Giacquinta, J.B. (1973). The process of organizational change in schools. In Kerlinger, F. B. (ed.), Review of Research in Education, 1, 178-208.

Giacquinta, J.B. (1975). Status risk-taking: A central issue in the initiation and implementation of public school innovations. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 9(1), 102-114.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. New York: State University of New York Press.

Havelock, R. G. (1973). The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.

Hord, S. M. (1992). Facilitative leadership: The imperative for change. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Joyce, B. (1990). Changing school culture through staff development. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kaslow, C. & Giacquinta, J.B. (1974). Faculty receptivity to organizational change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 090 847).

Louisiana Department of Education. (1991). Financial and Statistical Annual Report: 1990-1991. Baton Rouge: Author.

Loup, K. Chauvin, S. & Ellett, C. D. (1991). A qualitative study and synthesis of issues and concerns in the Louisiana Teaching Internship and Statewide Teacher Evaluation Programs: Learning from pilot program implementation in nine schools. A symposium presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

McLaughlin, M.W. & Pfeiffer, R. S. (1988). Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability and effective learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Parker, C. A. (1980). The literature on planned change: A review and analysis. Higher Education, 9, 429-442.

Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the institute for research on teaching, Educational Leadership, 45, 74-78.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.

Stern, C. & Keislar, E. R. (1977). Teacher attitudes and attitude change: A research review. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 10(2), 63-76.

Waugh, R. F. & Punch, K.F. (1987). Teacher receptivity to systemwide change in the implementation stage. Review of Educational Research, 57, 237-254.

Wilson, B., and Corbett, H. (1983). Organization and change: The effects of school linkages on the quantity of implementation. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(4), 85-104.